UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

American Religion: Whither Bound?

By RAYMOND H. PALMER

Japan and the United States

By HARRY L. KINGMAN

An Outline of the Possible Future History of the United States

By VLADIMIR KARAPETOFF

Trumpets on New Horizons

VOLUME CVIII NUMBER 24

Chicago, February 29, 1932

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago. Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MRS. EDNA R. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 379
American Religion: Whither Bound?—RAYMOND H. PALMER.. 381
Jottings—J. H. H. 383
ARTICLES—
Japan and the United States—HARRY L. KINGMAN..... 384
An Outline of the Possible Future History of the U. S. A.—VLADIMIR KARAPETOFF 385
THE STUDY TABLE—
History by an Historic Figure II.—TARAKNATH DAS..... 387
POETRY—
A Balanced Life—*Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes*..... 379
Trumpets on New Horizons:
The Social Game—STANTON A. COBLENTZ..... 390
The Wheels Are Still—HENRY E. SWENSEN..... 390
Druid Circle—JOY HAUSMAN..... 390
Tooth of Selfishness—MARGARET LATHROP LAW..... 390
Sun and Moon for the Few?—FANIA KRUGER..... 390
CORRESPONDENCE—
Professor Macintosh and the Editor—
I. HENRY W. PINKHAM..... 391
II. D. S. 392
THE FIELD—
Comments from Geneva (From Our Special Correspondent)—S. S. 378
The Futility of Violence—*Mira*..... 392
Institutes of International Relations..... 392

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Comments From Geneva

[From our Special Correspondent]

Paths to Peace. A committee, representing several international organizations has issued a 12-page leaflet, containing scripture bearing on peace, intended to cover the season of Lent, Feb. 10 to March 27, for daily reference. It is issued from 3 rue Monthoux, Geneva. The booklet is dedicated to the delegates of the Disarmament Conference. The scripture is quite suggestive, eg.:

Feb. 1.—"Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore."

Feb. 2.—"Cast out first the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye."

Peace Patriots. Have received from William Floyd, 114 E. 31st St. N. Y. C., a petition addressed to the Conference, calling for "Universal Total Disarmament as a measure that will help all countries and injure none." It contains the names of American citizens of distinguished ancestry (in patriotism) members of "Peace Patriots"—an organization in the U. S. A. whose slogan is "Love of Country; Opposition to War." It is held that the Pacifist is not only a good patriot, but pacifism, not militarism, is the mark of the highest patriotism. Good thing to get in touch with Mr. Floyd.

Permanent Peace. A letter from a friend in Northampton, Mass., says: "We are all hoping and praying that the Geneva Conference may do something towards bringing permanent peace in the world." He has voiced the cry of humanity. Of course, my friend knows that unless there is justice, love and harmony, mankind cannot claim peace—permanent peace. As I have mingled among the people here, too many are placing their own interests above the gaining of harmony. My friend has nailed up the right word—"permanent"—not to be forgotten.

Pessimistic. An intelligent friend writes me from Berlin, "I am personally rather pessimistic about that Conference, but hope nevertheless something may come of it." Of all men he would be the most joyful and to publish it abroad, if something great comes of it. Now is the time to work according to our hopes!

The Quaker Way. There are already several Quakers working on Peace Promotion here in Geneva. Others are on the way. So far I have met none, who, like Mrs. Lazarus and Miss Ashby of the Women's Peace Union, are standing for Total Disarmament *now*, and nothing else. This is ancient Quaker doctrine—*no guns or swords at all.* How I wish the Quakers, British and American, would stand, alone, if necessary, for the truth that has given them all the glory they enjoy. If they are not careful their candlestick will be removed. To have a Quaker Commander-in-Chief of the

(*Continued on page* 391)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CVIII MONDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1932 Number 24

A BALANCED LIFE

"Faith without Credulity.
Conviction without Bigotry.
Charity without Condescension.
Courage without Pugnacity.
Self-respect without Vanity.
Humility without Obsequiousness.
Love of humanity without Sentimentality.
Meekness with Power."

—Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes.

President Hoover did America the greatest of all services in appointing Judge Cardozo to the Supreme Court. In ability, character, learning and spirit, the Chief Justice of the New York Court of Appeals was the one man in the country fit to succeed Justice Holmes. Also, President Hoover did himself infinite credit in making this great appointment. Every petty and picayune consideration weighed against it—Judge Cardozo comes from New York (which state has two judges already on the Bench!), he is a Jew (and so is Justice Brandeis!), he is a Democrat! But Mr. Hoover rose to the dignity of true statesmanship, brushed these unworthy arguments aside, and did the one thing needful and admirable. Nothing gives us quite so much happiness as to praise one whom we often criticize. How happy an experience to write this editorial in praise of our President!

Toyohiko Kagawa, the great Japanese pacifist, has been imprisoned by the authorities of his country for resisting the policies of the military in Manchuria and Shanghai. This is by no means Kagawa's first experience of jail. In 1921 he was the leader of the strike of shipbuilders in Kobe, which was crushed only after violent action by the police assisted by two battalions of the army. He was the organizer of the Peasants' Union in Japan and of many industrial workers' unions, and has been conspicuous in the organization of the consumers' cooperative movement and of political labor parties. In these years since 1921, he has been arrested and imprisoned six times. Kagawa is a Socialist and a Christian. He is a pacifist of the absolutist type, and in his private life a man of utterly saintly character. Living by choice in poverty, he has given himself for years to the service of the ignorant and down-trodden among his countrymen. Details of this latest imprisonment seem not to be known, but it is easy to imagine Kagawa's immediate protest against the policy of ruthless militarism which has devastated Manchuria and ruined Shanghai. What a commentary upon our civilization is the fate of men of this truly religious character! Of all the millions upon this earth today, there are probably no nobler two than Mahatma Gandhi, of India, and Toyohiko Kagawa, of Japan. Both are lovers of peace and brotherhood. Both seek a larger freedom and a fuller life for the dumb, semi-starved multitudes of their helpless countrymen. Both are non-resistants, practicing non-violence as an ideal and discipline of their souls. Such men would not seem to be dangerous. Yet they are so terribly dangerous to the existing order of society that they are doomed to perpetual imprisonment. We count this fact a final condemnation of our civilization.

News out of India is scant these days. Day after day goes by, and not a despatch is to be seen in our newspapers. One might well imagine that the fight was over, and the British *Raj* supreme. But of course just the opposite is the case! The struggle is waxing fiercer every hour, and the censors are taking no risks in letting news escape. Now and again, however, a story comes through—as witness a remarkable cable despatch in a recent issue of the London *Daily Telegraph,* which we find referred to in the London *New Leader,* the organ of the Labor Party, as follows:

Unconquerable India

Those who thought that the British authorities had won their battle with the Indian National Congress by the ruthless arrest of all its leaders and the suppression of the organization are beginning to realize their mistake. Last Saturday's *Daily Telegraph* contained a long special cable from its Special Representative in Bombay emphasizing that the Congress picketing is "proving effective and having serious results on business." The manager of one of the large stores states that his turnover has been reduced by 50 per cent. The cotton piece business, the writer says, is "in a very bad plight." Fifty picketers were arrested last week. They are highly organized; "directly one is arrested another appears." This unconquerable spirit will defeat the severest Ordinances the Government can contrive.

This paragraph is heartening! It shows, first of all, that India is slowly but surely winning her cause. The boycott is the deadliest weapon ever forged for liberty. Used with the "unconquerable spirit" of Gandhi and the National Congress, it is certain in the end to overcome the fiercest fury of the Government. As

silence from India continues through the weeks ahead, we need feel no fear as to what is going on. Secondly, this paragraph from the *New Leader* is heartening because it shows that there are Englishmen, millions of them, who are just as eager for justice and freedom for India as we are. The great Labor Party is wholeheartedly for Gandhi's cause. In the face of this fact, no American need ever apologize for his championship of India on the ground that it is anti-English. On the contrary, our sympathy for Gandhi is not only support of India but support as well of the best and truest sentiment of England herself.

What may happen at Shanghai before this editorial is printed and read, no man can say. The city will probably be taken by the Japanese. But the victory will be a Pyrrhic victory in the extreme sense of the word, for the glory is all China's. Who could have believed that Chinese troops could put up a defense of this character—beat off attack after attack, cause the retirement of a Japanese admiral, summon a whole army division from the distant kingdom? What this amazing resistance may do in the way of enthusing and uniting the Chinese people remains to be seen. Japan, all unprepared, walked right into a tigers' den! It only goes to show the truth of Ferrero's recent declaration that a people in revolution are the last people in the world to take on for a fight. Who can ever forget the fighting of the French revolutionists of 1789 and later, when the autocrats of Europe undertook to restore the dethroned Bourbons? The mobilization of the raw recruits, the leadership of Carnot, the great war minister, the triumphant fighting on the frontiers, combine to make one of the supreme epics of history. The same story was told in the fighting that followed the Brest-Litovsk peace in revolutionary Russia. A dozen white armies poured over the borders, and headed their marches toward Moscow. And one after another these finely equipped armies were beaten and turned back by hordes of barefooted Bolsheviks, armed with the shattered and scattered remnants of the Tsar's armies. And now the tale is told again in China, where a great people, slowly awakened to consciousness, is fighting heroically and successfully against the hated invaders of its soil. In the old days it was easy to fight, defeat and dismember China, for then the attack was directed against a timid and all-powerful emperor, who was glad to make peace on any terms, and thus avoid trouble. But now the fighting is against a people—and that's a different proposition! Perhaps fighting is a bad thing all around. The militarists will be the last to discover it. But they will learn!

It is pathetic to see the eager and confident way in which the political and business interests of this country are clutching at the floating straws which seem to indicate a turn in the tide of the two years' depression. Let stocks go up a few points or a factory employ a few men, and instantly we get eight-column headline clamor that prosperity has returned. It is pathetic because so inane. Of course, the inflation legislation in Washington is melting some of the frozen assets. A balancing of the national budget and a stopping of bank failures will inevitably help to restore some measure of confidence. If President Hoover's attempt to end hoarding does not meet with the failure that has accompanied all his other attempts to do anything, there will be to this extent improvement. The passing of winter and the coming of spring are bound to bring some buying, which means some manufacturing. But no one of these things, nor all of them together, are going to affect to any substantial degree the real factors in the situation. This depression is not national, but world-wide. Its roots run deep into conditions which were created by the War, and have been steadily aggravated since the close of the War. All America's surplus, which means all of her real prosperity, must be marketed abroad. Which means that so long as Germany is steadily going to pieces, so long as Europe's vast population grows poorer day by day, so long as ten million unemployed walk the earth beyond the borders of our own country, so long as 15,000 miles of tariff walls mount higher and higher, so long as the storm of reparation and war debts brews upon the horizon, so long as the East flames with revolt, so long as the burden of armaments crushes labor and promises "the next war," just so long will America, and all other lands, welter in poverty and writhe in despair! Our capitalism is crumbling. Nothing that is attempted by any one nation alone can do more than shore up a beam or two, while the structure itself still cracks and totters. What we need is world statesmanship for a world problem. And that seems to be just the one thing that is absolutely non-existent.

There was significance in the universal sense of shock and grief which followed upon the death (on February 10th) of the English author, EDGAR WALLACE. Unlike Rudyard Kipling, this man had become no high tradition of British life. Unlike Bernard Shaw, he had not impressed his personality upon his contemporaries. Unlike the late Arnold Bennett, he could lay no claims to greatness. Perhaps it was Mr. Wallace's modesty as a prolific writer who never took himself over-seriously as a literary figure, that first captured the imagination of his readers. But feeling went deeper than this, and took on a form of affection and gratitude which was remarkable. What Edgar Wallace did was to write an almost endless series of novels, short stories, plays, scenarios, which offered distraction to an age which desperately sought distraction. He

came at just the time when he was most needed. To an age sickened by the horrors of the War, he brought the stimulus of innocent excitement in detective and mystery fiction. To men and women stricken with a more terrible discouragement and fear than they had ever known, he offered the solace of a fictitious world in which, out of vast difficulties and dangers, the hero emerged triumphant. While other authors were "sicklied o'er with the pale cast" of sex psychology and wierd fantasy and inner states of mind, Edgar Wallace kept to the simple plan of narrative adventure. His ingenuity was amazing, as his industry was unflagging. More than one hundred and fifty full-length novels sprang from his pen, and nobody knows how many magazine stories, plays, scenarios, editorials, articles, and letters. His reward was the allegiance of the greatest mulitude of readers possessed by any writer of modern times. It is a pity that he had to die at so comparatively early an age. He would have helped us to survive the dark days ahead.

American Religion: Whither Bound?

There must be a good many liberal and intelligent people in this country who are sick and tired of hearing religion treated cynically. We are one of those who do not believe whole-heartedly in any of the forms of organized religion existing anywhere in or out of Christendom. Every church we know of, and we are fairly well acquainted in this field, is full of absurdities, inconsistencies and irrationalities which no intelligent man in his right senses can accept. American religion has been as ugly as American architecture, and as cheap as American politics. But religion is now and always has been the embodiment of human idealism in the best form possible at any given time and in any given place. The reason why religion in this country has been so repulsive to a person of delicate sensibilities is because it has been, as it must always be, a reflection of the level at which the average mind exists. It is one thing to observe that the level is low, another thing entirely to ridicule the motives and hidden impulses which lie beneath the crude expressions of religious aspiration.

When one surveys the field of American religion, either past or present, one is appalled at the crudity and stupidity of it. Revivalism with its emotional orgies, fundamentalism with its dogmatic blindness, modernism with its shallow and easy tolerance—none of these has, or can ever have, a forceful appeal to the thoughtful person. But if religion in this nascent American civilization is orgiastic, dogmatic or shallow, then, let us ask, what else is there in our national life that is any better? When religion was revivalistic, so was politics; camp-meetings and torch-light parades went together. When religion has been literal and dogmatic, so has politics been; worship of the Bible has gone hand in hand with worship of the Constitution. When religion became modernistic and shallow in this country, so did politics; people now have no church and no party; they are too "broad" for such restrictions.

It is certainly true, however, that the camp-meeting, with all its excesses and barbarities, was on a higher level than the torch-light parade. So has fundamentalism with regard to the Bible been more desirable than the corresponding worship of the law and the Constitution. And today, with all the easy-going shallowness which modernism has brought into the churches, organized religion is still on a higher plane than politics, even though there is no basic difference in our national attitudes in politics and religion.

It is true, of course, that under any prevailing type of religious expression there are always individuals who transcend the cultus in which they live, and when one measures the mass by the superior individual who emerges from it in any time or place, religion, if we mean by that the faith of the mass, suffers by comparison. Thus, from a certain point of view, Jesus appears to be an anti-religious person, who, sensing the absurdities in religion, condemned it. Socrates, from the same point of view, condemned religion. So did Gotama. So did Montaigne. So did Chaucer. And Dante. And Emerson. If one wishes to condemn religion, he has all these superior persons on his side. So did they condemn it. Jesus and Gotama condemned it in the spirit of prophets. Socrates and Montaigne condemned it in the spirit of detached and judicial spectators, using irony as their weapon. Dante condemned it by a method all his own. Chaucer condemned it in the spirit of a humorist in the profound sense. Emerson condemned it in the spirit of one seeking the company of those who had already done so.

But what, actually, did these men condemn? Not one of them, in any true sense, was cynical toward religion itself. They trained their guns on human weaknesses, and they sent volley after volley of prophetic denunciation, biting irony, dissolving humor and piercing epigram into the shams and pretenses of humanity, but never did they ridicule the deeper aspirations of the human mind. They revealed men caught in a maze of trivialty, or lost in a cloud of theologic dust, or poisoned by the incubus of fame and fortune, but they never denounced the virtues of reverence, soli-

tude, rectitude, hope, mercy, courage, self-sacrifice or love, and they realized that wherever virtue becomes a living, pulsating thing, there is religion.

The recognition of vital virtue as religion, and the clear-eyed distinction between the chaff and the grain, is what characterizes all of the great teachers of humanity. Cynicism toward virtue, when such cynicism is present in a superior mind, inevitably robs the person who manifests it of the peculiar luster which always accompanies a spirit of the first rank. Even Montaigne, with all his frankness about sex and religion, never ceases to consider himself as a moral agent, responsible for his own character and capable of pursuing perfection with a truly religious intensity. Moral grandeur shines through Montaigne's gospel of moderation, and if it does not burn with the white heat of Dante, it is still certainly not comparable to the utter lack of moral seasoning to be discovered in the sloppy dish of stewed moron served up to adolescent America by the tribe of Mencken.

Chaucer made his Canterbury pilgrims far more convincing sinners than Mencken has made of his backslapping Rotarians. The difference, as I see it, is that Chaucer was a religious man, and not ashamed of it, while, if Mencken is religious at all, he would be the last one to acknoweldge it. Chaucer had a capacity for pity which Mencken has never had, and the reason for that is that Chaucer had subjected himself to religious influences which brought him compassion for those whose foibles and sins he despised. We have said sins. Yes, Chaucer's pilgrims were sinners, but Mencken's morons are not sinners; they are only plain damfools. Chaucer had sympathy with those he exposed (who does not believe that he felt a certain kinship even with the Wife of Bath and the Pardoner?), but Mr. Mencken has no sympathy because he has no religion, no humility. Chaucer went to Canterbury with the rest; Mencken would never have been caught in that lowdown act of traveling with morons. The point is obvious: Chaucer did not condemn the pilgrimage to Canterbury; what he wished to show with infinite pity and profound humor was that human beings are lovable and companionable despite all their baseness, and that religion, while it is good in itself, draws together like a magnet a motley crew of both saints and sinners.

Mencken, if he had written the Canterbury Tales, would have spent himself in an effort to show that nobody but fools and imbeciles would ever think of going on a religious pilgrimage anyway, but Chaucer was wiser than that. And his wisdom was the precipitate of a genuinely religious spirit. I have often wondered what Geoffrey Chaucer would have made of H. L. Mencken, if this vociferous and cynical pilgrim had sat for his portrait to the first of English humorists. Perhaps Chaucer would have turned out a polished version of the following:

And whan thy Treatise don al is,
  And hast y made the gods look silly
Instead of wit and newe thinges
  Thou pickest on some poor hill-billy.

And whan thou hast his words reprinted,
  And all embalmed within thy pages,
Because thy clod hast not recanted,
  Thou fliest into other rages,
Until thy voice is very hoarse,
  And hast no sweetness or persuasion,
But only bitter is, and coarse;
  And thou no longer a sensation.

The exponents of a higher culture for America ought to learn that unless culture and religion can be brought together, neither can ever reach a high plane. The divorce between them, which is feverishly sought by some of our recent writers and thinkers, would inevitably lead to disastrous results.

Culture depends upon the absorption by each generation of the wisdom of the past, and that past wisdom is inextricable from its religious setting. If one were a twentieth-century individual completely incapable of religious responses, yet anxious to become a cultured person, he would find himself with the doors shut against him. He might study Greek literature, but he could never understand it. He might read everything ever written by the great English writers from Venerable Bede to Joseph Conrad, but it would be incomprehensible to a person without some religious feeling and insight. Indeed, to put it in another way, the reason why religion so often goes to seed is because it cuts itself off from these cultural sources of its life. A church which denies the essentially religious character of all literature, and tries to make an arbitrary distinction between sacred and secular writings, as the Christian church has done, is cutting its own throat. There is no choice for an intelligent person between a Mencken who would deny to culture its eternal dependence on religion and the blind leaders in the churches who would make themselves the arbiters and judges of culture. The relation between the two must remain absolutely free.

There is no doubt but that American Christianity has been greatly enriched by the Bible. It is fortunate that a country like ours, in passing through a period of its religious history when culture has been much frowned upon, should have yet taken as the very foundation of its religious existence a foundation stone in the culture of the race. American religion has often done much to cut itself off from the culture of the world, but at the same time it has unwittingly made this impossible by basing its very existence on the Bible. The Bible ties it in with the literature of the world.

But while organized religion has made a complete divorce from culture impossible by clinging to the Scriptures, it has by the same act brought the Bible

and itself under an eclipse. If organized religion would give up the Bible as its own private property, and release it for wholesale consumption, this would do much to bring the book to its proper place in the literature of humanity, and it would pave the way for the establishment of religion not upon one body of writings but upon the entire literature of the race.

If organized religion in America would frankly break off its special connection with the Hebrew and Christian scriptures, not because it ceases to worship the wisdom they contain but because it wishes to remove the idea that there is any odor of hypocritical sanctity about them, this would destroy the idea of the Bible as a fetish and leave religion free to seek its inspiration from the entire body of human knowledge and wisdom.

Some will say that American religion wishes to remain Christian, and that to give up the New Testament especially as a chosen scripture, sacred above all other writings, would be in essence a denial of Christianity. The answer to this is that there is no special virtue in Christianity as such. Religion in America is not one bit better by clinging tenaciously to the claim that it is Christian, when every honest pastor knows, as he analyzes his church, that the claim is meaningless. Few pastors would wish to offer their congregations as examples of Christian living. Remove from church members the right to claim special allegiance to the teachings of Jesus by reason alone of the fact that they go to a church where his sayings are written in a book which they see before them on Sunday, and you take away from them nothing but a convenient substitute for noble conduct. By taking away the substitute the churches would make it easier to demand the real thing.

We once were in a church, of a very liberal persuasion, where the pastor attempted to take the Bible, a huge one, off of the pulpit. He was severely criticised, and the Bible soon reappeared in its old place, but the people in the church read it very little either before or after this episode. They simply felt that church was not church without it there. The intention of the pastor was not to deny to the Bible a place in his preaching, for he used it much in this respect, but to impress upon his people that the pulpit was to be a source of inspiration from every quarter and not from the Bible alone.

America is fast becoming a nation whose people feel no special allegiance to any particular brand of faith. Slowly but surely the Bible is coming to be regarded not as a sacred book but as a literature of amazing interest and value, to be read as one reads any other book which he finds interesting or inspiring. This has a tendency to divorce the people from religion, for, if religion is synonymous with the Bible, and the Bible has ceased to be a peculiarly religious book, then, think the people, we have ceased to be religious; we are now pagan. What of it? One may be pagan and religious as easily as he can be Christian and religious. It is time for the churches in America to stop the drift away from religion, and to heal the breach between religion and culture, by asserting that organized religion in this country has no desire to set up special and absurdly extravagant claims for any book or books, but that the churches propose to make themselves the disseminators and guardians of the whole culture of humanity.

If the churches would act on this basis, then they would become as free as literature itself is free. A new priesthood would develop in the pulpit. Preachers would be forced to show a power of judgment in choosing, from the whole body of human writings, ideas and inspiration which, when presented to the people, would be judged not by the source from which they were taken but by the validity of their ethical and idealistic content. Every semblance of divorce between religion and culture would be broken down, and the whole culture of the race would flow through the churches and the minds of its leaders as water flows through a purifying system. No preacher could then present the barbarities of the scriptures as ethically justifiable or religiously inspiring simply because they happened to be found in the Bible any sooner than he could present ideas that shocked the sensibilities of the people from any other source.

Religion would then be organized to do one thing, and to do that one thing well, namely, to search for wisdom cooperatively under the best leadership obtainable in a free and undogmatic atmosphere. To go to church would be to go in search of wisdom, deep, clear, beautiful and true. If that time ever comes, and we believe it is coming, the churches will be filled. And religion will be restored to its rightful place of dignity and power among the people.

RAYMOND H. PALMER.

Jottings

Letters from some of our readers indicate a belief that the Editor wrote the "Declaration of an American Citizen," to which his name was signed in the January 18th issue of UNITY. It should therefore be explained that this superb "Declaration" was written by Charles Clayton Morrison, of the *Christian Century,* and by him distributed to the various journals which joined in its proclamation. Mr. Holmes signed it publicly, because he is not accustomed to ask others to sign what he has not first signed himself.

President Hoover is opposed to the "dole." Is he?

What is the Reconstruction Finance Corporation but a "dole" to capital?

The Pope of Rome, in his encyclical, *"Lux Veritatis,"* appealed to Protestants to end the schisms of Christendom by returning to the Roman fold. Dr. Peter Ainslie, of Baltimore, promptly addressed a letter to the Holy Father, inviting him to appoint a commission of Catholics, to confer with a similar commission of Protestants "over the points that divide us, in order that we of this day may make some contribution toward reconciliation in the divided and unreconciled house of the Lord." Has anybody heard of any answer from the Pope to this admirable letter?

John D. Rockefeller, Sr., says that he sees nothing to worry about. Not while his supply of nickels for the poor holds out!

Finland, having thrown over Prohibition, is now trying to find out how to control the liquor traffic. The new government bill provides, among other things, for a vigorous "campaign against the illegal liquor trade." But we are told by our "wet" friends in this country that "the illegal liquor trade"—bootlegging, rum-running, and the rest—is the product of Prohibition. What's the matter in Finland—or with our sapient "wets"?

DEFINITIONS. (2) *Disarmament*—the scrapping of obsolete arms, in order to provide funds for modern arms. J. H. H.

Japan and the United States

An outbreak of armed hostility between Japan and the United States as a result of contemporary Japanese activities in China is unlikely. Yet it is possible. At the moment the international situation in Shanghai is one in which anything might happen. A local fracas between overwrought Japanese and American troops, an irresponsible insult to the flag, or the loss of American lives may take place at any moment. Then might come a resultant flare-up of war spirit at home which would make possible a declaration of war. The ruthless slaughter of Chinese civilians during the past few weeks, in retaliation for provocative Chinese action, has already stirred a dangerous revulsion of feeling against Japan, as it did against Great Britain at the time of the Wanshien bombardment in 1925 in the Yangtze Valley.

For Japan's aggressiveness since the middle of September the United States is not without blame. In the first place had the United States from the outset fully participated with the League Council Japan would almost surely have satisfied herself with a brief "strafing" of the Chinese in South Manchuria. The threat of a comprehensive economic boycott would almost certainly have had an economic effect. Japan's ever-widening aggressions have developed only with the assurance of a lack of unity between the United States and the League.

In the second place Japan has been able to justify her intervention in China by pointing to American military activities in Latin America. In the third place our reprehensible immigration bill of 1924 which by discriminating against Japan gave her cause to think that her national honor had been slighted strengthened the nationalistic forces in Japan which desired imperialistic expansion and hegemony in Asia. Incidentally, Japanese ill-will toward the United States because of our discriminatory exclusion law has successfully kept the United States from playing the influential part in the Far East this winter which would ordinarily be expected of us. In the fourth place the United States by its aggressive policy of securing a strangle-hold throughout the world on such essential natural resources as fuel and ores forces Japan to enter the scramble.

War upon Japan by the United States and other Powers can be of no service in solving Sino-Japanese problems. Fundamentally the solution lies with China. The fact that even after four months of Japan's ruthless procedure some of China's leaders are even yet unwilling to make their own selfish designs subservient to the welfare of the Chinese nation suggests that that solution lies in the dim future. Only when the Chinese join hands patriotically to solve their internal difficulties and to present a unified and sound resistance to Japanese encroachments can the situation be effectively altered. Since 1925 China has been waging a justifiable although sometimes extremely provocative campaign to rid herself of foreign domination. But whenever there has been a repercussion, as when Moscow retaliated in 1929 and Japan in 1931, internal Chinese flabbiness has prompted her to rest her defense chiefly with the League of Nations or the Kellogg Pact. The one bright spot in the present picture is that an increasing number of responsible Chinese are admitting that their salvation depends upon themselves. When that spirit fully develops and materializes China will no doubt find Japan ready to display a conciliatory and cooperative spirit. China is destined eventually to become one of the world's most powerful nations.

An unhappy feature of present developments is the exploitation of the Japanese people by their own militarists. The international spirit has been rapidly growing in Japan. Among the youth there has been fast developing opposition to military service. The scaling down of army and navy budgets was causing the military clique vast alarm. The possibility of a new interpretation of the Constitution which would give the elected government adequate control over the Army and Navy was increasing. At the time that the Army undertook its Manchurian *coup* on September 18th it appeared that militarism in Japan was on the toboggan. Unfortunately this growing pacifism was not able, when put to the test, to cope successfully with a war psychology fostered by clever propaganda. The huge public ceremonies for soldiers killed in Manchuria, the display of propaganda scrolls written in blood, the shutting off of dispatches to newspapers refusing

to take dictation from the War Department, by such methods Japanese public opinion has been largely won over to a support of the intervention in China. When the truth comes out and when the pressure of economic facts grows heavy the reaction will come. It will come, that is, unless the United States by single-handed action against Japan robs the Japanese people of the rationality to perceive that their own military clique is seriously mortgaging the national future.

An economic boycott of Japan by the major Powers in concert may, if it can be achieved, prove necessary. Its cost might well be considered as a premium on an insurance policy protecting us from the terrific future costs of war. Participation, possibly, in a general boycott, yes, but war between the United States and Japan must not develop. It would be utterly disastrous. Even though an incident occur which formerly would have been answerable only by war, the American public needs to maintain self-control. Not only would it probably take years and many billions of dollars for the United States to conquer Japan but at the end what would have been accomplished? Many people would have been killed but the guilty members of the Japanese military clique would still, for the most part, remain unscathed. Colossal destruction of property would have merely provided soil for the growth of hatred and future strife. And through new encouragement of the Chinese to suppose that the United States could still be depended upon to shoulder Chinese responsibilities the fundamental solution of Sino-Japanese relationships would be only further postponed.

HARRY L. KINGMAN.

An Outline of the Possible Future History of the U. S. A.

I. Events likely to happen

(*because human nature is what it is*)

When a person has had one of his hands mangled in a machine and subsequently amputated, there is a period of acute suffering followed by one of considerable discomfort and adjustment, and finally a changed life of a partially disabled person. So the present acute period of industrial depression will be over sooner or later, but the standards of living of the working classes will not be restored. Besides, there will be a reserve army of unemployed, as in most European countries. On top of this, serious doubts will be raised in the minds of many about the soundness of the fundamental principles of our political and economic life, principles now taken as self-evident and incontrovertible; among others, the capitalistic form of production and distribution, private ownership of land, sturdy individualism, the ideal of material wealth and goirg after it to the exclusion of finer things in life, high protective tariff coupled with an aggressive selling policy abroad, the belief that we can indefinitely maintain standards of living much superior to those in other civilized countries, the general belief in our mental and volitional superiority and mission to run the rest of the world, the faith in our form of government as being the best possible, especially in its legislative and judicial functions, and the general naive confidence that somehow providence will take care of its new chosen people in spite of their selfishness and blunders.

Outwardly, we shall still continue to live our present mode of living and thinking, and superficially discharge our duties as citizens, but the self-intoxication with movies, shallow newspapers, sponsored radio speeches, and alcoholic liquor will gradually give place to sober analytical thinking. All kinds of unprecedented currents of public opinion will arise, new outlandish political and economic doctrines will be advocated, discussion clubs and societies will spring up like mushrooms with mottoes and slogans each intended to be a cure-all. The youth will be particularly active, not necessarily the present youth but their children or perhaps their children's children, rested mentally and taken good care of physically for two or three generations of easy-going, drifting and jazz. Skepticism and indifference will be replaced by an earnest faith that a solution of economic ills is possible, is nigh, and that life's most worthy purpose is to seek such a solution and having found it to fight for it. The topics about which the discussion will center and the measures advocated will be clearly recognizable as an intense reaction against things as they now are. Group action and the restraint of an over-ambitious individual; production and distribution by the state rather than by private corporations; government by experts and not by politicians; dictatorship in big technical questions; sacrifice of national honor for the sake of international good will, and in general a socialistic and communistic attitude towards life and its problems.

In the meantime, the actual state of economic affairs, both nationally and internationally, will go from bad to worse, capitalism tottering on its last legs and gasping for breath. So the academic discussions will soon give place to definite advocacy of direct action, and much bitterness and intolerance will be manifested. The impatient and less educated majority will be swayed by the simple and to them self-evident expedient of taking everything over, if necessary by force, setting up a new government and living happily thereafter. More cautious and educated groups will advocate less direct action and will discuss "step-by-step conversion" theories. Each group will be split into several differing in details and hating each other worse than their adversaries. The proponents of capitalism will not yield an iota and will not be able to assume any sort of constructive conciliatory attitude because of lack of unity among themselves. Many will feel that giving in even a little would simply encourage the masses to demand more, whereas by resisting they can keep the radicals fighting each other about the exact course of direct action to be taken.

Then something will happen, a war, another depression, a drought, a plague, or what not, after which many millions of our population will have nothing to lose and, using a familiar slogan, "a world to gain." The impatient, the lawless, the starved, the ignorant, the abused ones will rise almost instinctively, without any pre-arranged program. Then either the revolution itself or the civil war which is to follow it will wreck a number of things, good, bad, and indifferent in our political, economic, and social structure. They will wreck them just out of vengeance, out of lust for lawlessness and destruction, out of desire to let go the inhibitions of years and even generations. No

sooner, however, will the revolution be well under way than those anti-violence leaders and thinkers who did not have the temerity to start the melee themselves will try to organize a new order of things, faction fighting faction, and the party with the strongest dictatorial leader and the simplest immediate program of reforms comprehensible to the masses will finally win the upper hand.

After order has been restored, it will be found that many good and indispensable institutions and methods have been judicially ruined and will have to be restored, even if by another name and in a disguised form. In those days, the form and a high sounding principle will mean everything, statistics nothing. People will gladly starve in the name of the cooperative commonwealth and will submit without murmur to arbitrary decisions of amateur experts, forgetting or even ridiculing the old principle of no taxation without representation. The period of disorder and readjustment will be comparatively short because of the excellent methods of mass production and distribution developed under the hated capitalism, and because our ingrained sense of industrial discipline will be found adequate to take care of the economic life of the country. In fact, the only thing that has needed a change will be found to be the ownership of the productive wealth and the general point of view which will be epitomized in some motto such as "one for all and all for one."

The economic needs having been taken care of, a stupendous program will be opened of merging individualities into larger groups wherein each is to find his or her full self-realization without duplication or domination by others. Collective personalities will rise, with new accomplishments, political, scientific, and artistic, impossible for single individuals, and a new era of civilization will be ushered in, with the old conflict between the individual and society solved in a purely psychological manner.

Unfortunately, this golden age of utopian collectivism will not last long. The generation which will have fought for it and perhaps one or two succeeding generations will cherish its principles and the new mode of life, by comparison with the bleak, uncertain and irritating existence under capitalism; they will close their eyes on temporary shortcomings and inherent make-believes, with full faith that in time such would be remedied. Then the primitive man will re-assert himself here and there, the old biological call-of-the-wild will be obeyed, and many will begin secretly to cherish the bygone and to them romantic times of private ownership and sturdy individualism. Television plays will picture in an alluring way strong capitalists quickly achieving wonderful results by squeezing out competitors, manipulating banks, bulldozing workers into submission, and many a young man will be thrilled imagining himself such a hero, as we are thrilled by a good Western picture of bygone days.

Adventurous men and women will seek fields of activity not yet reglemented by the collectivist government, will plan their lives so as to be as little dependent upon the state as possible, and have as much self-determination as various dictatorships will admit. In time there will be a revolt against this constant curbing of one's individuality to the best welfare of society, and a troublesome group will arise, small at first, and growing larger (somewhat like our socialists and communists) demanding individual freedom, a freedom even to oppress fellow human beings if they are weak enough to be oppressed. Plausible arguments will be advanced, such as more rapid progress, justice to stronger minds, and a general biological law which no man can escape no matter how highly civilized.

In time it will become necessary to yield in part to these persistent demands, but the final compromise reached will not be something between collectivism and present-day individualism (for history does not repeat itself), but something entirely new, much better than either, and yet something so remote from us that we cannot even dimly foresee its nature.

II. Events which ought to take place

(if human nature were different)

The present Congress, clearly realizing the deep underlying causes of our economic depression and the crying need for a radical change in the underlying principles of our economic and political life (especially in those portions of the Constitution which are evoked in defense of private property rights), should vote for a large permanent committee of experts to work out a scientific program of thoroughgoing reforms. Moreover, the Congress should pass by a large majority a resolution to the effect that it would promptly approve the needed changes in the obsolete portions of the Constitution, as recommended by the Committee. The legislatures of all the states should also convene promptly and unanimously pledge a ratification of constitutional amendments as they are submitted to them.

At the very first meeting, the Committee of experts should establish the following general principles: (A) All key industries must be controlled by the Federal Government or by the state governments, for consumption and use, and not for private profit. (B) A twenty-five year period of re-adjustment is to be established during which all the present bonded indebtedness and other direct obligations of the borrowing corporations in the key industries are to be gradually amortized or taken over by the government, with as little hardship to the owners as possible. (C) During the same period the stockholders are to be gradually paid off, on the same principles as when the government exercises the right of eminent domain in building a road. The actual money invested in the property (and not the dividends, or reproduction value, or the market values of the stocks) is to be used in such a settlement, and only one appeal from the decision of the valuation body is to be allowed. (D) The hours of labor are to be reduced until there is but little unemployment, the temporarily lowered standard of living being in part compensated by cooperative buying, model tenements, social insurance, steady employment, etc. (E) Agriculture is to be considered a key industry, and huge government owned and operated farms on the most suitable lands are to be gradually substituted for present small unproductive farms, with the rural population re-adjusted accordingly over a period of twenty-five years. (F) All legal and constitutional obstacles to the foregoing reforms are to be removed by the Congress as fast as possible; this shall include United States Supreme Court judges who should obstruct the ushering in of the new era by their formal decisions.

From there on, the Committee of Experts, the Congress, and the state legislatures are to work hand

in hand, gradually realizing the outlined reforms one by one, firmly curbing greed and opposition, and yet allowing ample time for those deprived of income from securities to adjust their lives in useful work, to receive help from relatives, or be granted a modest government pension. The international situation, especially the high tariff and the colonial policies which irritate other nations, are to receive most careful attention. Everywhere, the changes must be consistent and in the same direction, the policy firm, yet no radical or rash steps are to be taken, so as to allow for re-adjustment.

After twenty-five years, there would be still many undesirable conditions, yet much would be accomplished, the changes would be quite permanent, any particular policies which should prove to be undesirable could be readily modified without bringing in chaos. Everyone would understand the purpose of the changes, the cooperative principle would be in partial operation and at the same time there would be considerable room for private initiative in less essential fields; a minimum standard of living would be established for anyone willing and capable of working. On the surface, a violent revolution could accomplish much more at first, but a reaction would set in, with accompanying misery and struggles, and the net result in twenty-five years would be much less.

This plan has only one fault, but this fault is fatal: human minds, wills, and emotions do not work in unison on important reforms, and the scheme just outlined could never be carried out in practice, at least not in this country, even if the Lord God himself put his stamp of approval on it and commanded its execution. Well, then, let us eat, drink, and be merry, and when the catastrophe comes let us face it as men and women of courage, ready to build up again from the ruins that are left.

VLADIMIR KARAPETOFF.

The Study Table

History By An Historic Figure

II

Foreign Policies*

Prince von Bulow, as an Imperial Chancellor, was not a novice in foreign affairs. He entered the German Foreign Office in 1873 as a young attache, at the time when his father was at its head, as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. In 1878 he acted as one of the secretaries of the Berlin Congress. He had the exceptional opportunity of mastering foreign relations as a diplomatic official of Germany in St. Pertersburg, Paris, Roumania, Rome, Vienna and other centres. He himself served for several years as Secretary of Foreign Affairs, during the Chancellorship of Prince Hohenloe whom he succeeded in 1903. Bulow was thoroughly Bismarckian in his attitude in matters of German foreign policy and maintained cordial relations with the "Iron Chancellor" in his retirement.

1. *Principles Underlying Bulow's Foreign Policy:*

Before discussing particular and important events of international relations handled by Prince Bulow, it may be wise to inquire into the fundamentals of his foreign policy. A long letter, written to his brother General Alfred von Bulow of the War Office, throws full insight into Prince von Bulow's foreign policy. (1) Bulow was not a pacifist, but was convinced that Germany had nothing to gain from a war.

> Prince Bismarck, in his immortal speech in the market place at Jena, declared he had waged three necessary wars. After these, he continued, there was no need for us to wage any others. *From future wars we had nothing to gain. It would be the result of incompetence or negligence if we let ourselves be drawn into war.* . . . If many folk and some whole sections of opinion—even people at Court, even journalists, deputies, professors—want a Foreign Minister who will hurry Germany into a war . . . they had better look for a new Imperial Chancellor, I am not the man for that sort of thing. By misuse of the noble words "glory" and "honor" great nations have been led into the abyss. (p. 256.)

(2) As a German statesman, Bulow was determined to uphold German rights everywhere. He was firm but polite to foreigners and was opposed to the attitude of the pan-German press and their jingoism.

> I am as firm and conscientious as any man where Germany's rights and interests are at stake; in that I will yield to nobody. Let these people make definite objections, who vaguely accuse me of tenderness to foreigner. . . . What they cannot see is that it is a matter of being firm or polite at the right moment. *A consistently overbearing, inconsiderate and chauvinist tone, ill manners, and such violent provocations of the foreigner as we all see too constantly in certain sections of our Press, work to our detriment.* If I, in my responsible position were to adopt them, incalculable consequences would follow. . . . My knowledge puts be in a position to see dangers of which they have no inkling, and prevents me from being ruled by purely subjective emotion. . . . I oppose the application of that famous sabre-rattling policy, which Bismarck never applied at the wrong moment, to circumstances calling for a clear head and a wary hand. To those who can only din "national pride" into my ears I answer that true national pride consists in keeping firmly in view in all circumstances, the real and abiding interests of the nation. The fate of the Second Empire and of Napoleon III have shown us where a policy of romantic jingoism leads a country. That Emperor was neither ignoble nor ungifted and yet in the end he lost his throne. I do not want us, too, to end in a catastrophe. (pp. 253-255.)

(3) Bulow was neither anti-British nor pro-Russian nor pro-Austrian. He was essentially a "pro-German" statesman who tried to adjust his foreign policy to further German interests. He wrote:

> I want to remain on good terms with England, but on a footing of complete equality, on a basis of complete independence. We must never let ourselves be misused—and least of all against Russia—as the sword of England on the Continent. . . . It is not merely criminal, it is *stupid,* to embitter German feeling against England, always and everywhere to stir up hatred against England, to fan tiny sparks into blaze (p. 258). . . . So long as I remain at the helm I shall continue steadfastly to pursue the policy I have pursued till today. We must not awaken Russian mistrust by flirting with the Poles or opposing the Russians in the Dardanelles, the pivot of Bismarck's Reinsurance Treaty. In the East we must prevent Austria from adventuring against the Balkan States (Roumania, Serbia, Montenegro) in the interests of ambitious Staff Officers and fiery Magyrs. Neither the old Emperor, Francis Joseph, nor the anti-Magyr Slavophile Heir Apparent, have any desire for such escapades. Let us prevent any action which Russia could not accept, and I do not see why peace should not be maintained. *"To keep the peace is our first task and is a necessity for us,"* once said Bismarck to the deputation of Swabians who

---

*Review of "Memoirs of Prince von Bulow." (Continued from last week.)

came to Friedrichsruhe to do him honor. His words remain true today. (pp. 258-259.)

If one examines critically the actions of Prince von Bulow in the field of foreign relations of Germany, he is convinced that he followed the policy of peace in most difficult situations.

2. *Franco-German Relations:* (1) The Morocco Crisis: Germany was on the verge of a war with France on account of the French efforts to establish a protectorate over Morocco without consulting Germany whose rights were guaranteed by the Morocco Conference of 1880 (Treaty of Madrid) and by the German-Moroccan Commercial Treaty of 1890. After the conclusion of the Anglo-French Treaty of 1904 Delcassé adopted the policy of making Morocco another Tunis, which would have destroyed German rights as guaranteed by the above mentioned two treaties. Bulow was convinced that unless a check was imposed on Delcassé's policy the peace of the world would be disturbed and therefore he advised the Kaiser to take a firm stand and land at Tangier during his Mediterranean cruise (p. 124) and make a pronouncement recognizing the status of the Sultan of Morocco as an Independent sovereign. Germany was determined not to go to war with France, but at the same time demanded that an International Conference should decide the status of Morocco. Bulow writes:

If France wished to seize economic and political power in Morocco, the remaining signatories of that Madrid Conference of 1880 must be asked for their permission. Apart from this Madrid Agreement, there had existed a commercial treaty between Germany and Morocco since 1890 which accorded us preferential treatment. We were, therefore, in the fortunate position of being able to base ourselves on international justice. (p. 123.)

The whole question was solved by the Algeciras Conference and the Treaty of Algeciras (7th of April 1906) which was in a sense a victory for German diplomacy because "it reaffirmed the sovereignty of the Sultan" and secured German right to co-operate in the future development of Moroccan affairs (p. 231). The Pan-German Press was not satisfied with the result. (p. 232).

(2) The Casablanca Incident: The German Consul at Casablanca was accused of aiding some Austrian deserters from the French legion and the French took a high-handed action against the Consulate. This strained the relations between the two countries. While the Pan-Germans were advocating strong measures Bulow agreed to settle the question by submitting it to the Court of Arbitration.

3. *The Second Hague Conference and Germany:* It is generally regarded that Germany did not wish to participate in this conference for the promotion of peace and the German attitude checked the progress of the policy of arbitration. Prince von Bulow held that the advocates of compulsory arbitration in the Second Hague Conference were insincere. While Germany rejected compulsory arbitration, she aided the cause of world peace by advocating a Permanent Court of Arbitration.

The establishment of a permanent court of arbitration was the work of the German delegate (Herr von Marchall); later he was the spokesman for that minority which rejected compulsory arbitration and Belgium, Switzerland and Turkey were among the States which supported Germany and Austria in rejecting it. This seems a characteristic indication on which side the honesty really lay, since nobody could doubt the sincere desire for peace of these little States, whereas compulsory arbitration was championed by the States of the Entente whose pacifism only the naivest of politicians could take as genuine. (p. 331.)

He further writes:

I had, of course, never any thought of sacrificing the safety of the country to the sanctimonious assurances of our enemies and those who coveted our good fortune; to the hollow phrase-mongering of unsophisticated and occasionally dishonest, fanatics. That standpoint I need scarcely defend, now that the world has seen the victorious Allies, having got what they wanted by the use of Wilson's Fourteen Points, drawn up to deceive our silly German pacifists, throw off the pacifist mask to show the sneering, cruel face beneath. The Treaty of Versailles is an outrage against all pacifist principles and ideas. (p. 329.)

The above statements of Prince von Bulow should be carefully considered, because his views are shared by the German nation as a whole.

4. *Russo-German Relations:* (1) Treaty of Bjorko: Kaiser Wilhelm II was most anxious to cement Russo-German friendship and he thought that he would be able to accomplish it through his personal influence over the Tsar and by rousing Russian suspicion against Britain which aided Japan as an ally during the Russo-Japanese War. Wilhelm II, in the face of the existence of the Franco-Russian Alliance, had not only undue optimism but minimized the obstacles in the way of accomplishing a Russo-German Alliance. Bulow was in favor of promoting Russo-German friendship but cautioned his imperial master against any precipitate action, but suggested that in the proposed meeting between the Tsar and the Kaiser, the latter should request the former that the Russian Foreign Minister would open negotiations for a new treaty of friendship between Germany and Russia. The Kaiser during his visit with the Tsar in the Island of Bjorko (in July, 1905) induced the Tsar to sign a treaty of alliance which was unacceptable to the Russian ministers and later on repudiated by the Tsar.

(2) Count Witte on Russo-German Alliance: After the conclusion of the Russo-Japanese War and the Treaty of Portsmouth, Count Sergei Witte met Bulow in Berlin and had a discussion of all questions relating Russo-German Relations.

Witte's ideal was still a German-Russian-French alliance against the English. He tried to convince me (Bulow) that if we (Germans) restored Lorraine to France, a grouping of this kind would not be impossible. (p. 188.)

Bulow showed Witte the impracticability of any such policy under the existing circumstances. After this conference Witte was received by the Kaiser in his hunting lodge at Rominten. The Kaiser informed Witte of the agreement signed at Bjorko. Witte expressed his gratification; but after his return to St. Petersburg, when Count Lamsdorf showed him the text of the said agreement, Witte used his influence so that the treaty would be denounced.

(3) The Bosnian Crisis: After the defeat of the Russians in the Russo-Japanese War, Russia tried to increase her influence in the Balkan countries. In this policy she was encouraged by France as well as England. British policy, especially that of King Edward was to prevent Russo-German Alliance. Bulow writes:

I am convinced that King Edward's whole policy was directed towards preventing our alliance with Russia. He wanted to keep us apart. (p. 34.)

After the conclusion of the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907 and King Edward's visit to the Tsar at Reval, Russian foreign policy, under the direction of Isvolsky,

was to secure the control over the Dardanelles at the earliest opportunity.

As early as 1876 Gortachakov, on behalf of the Russian government signed an agreement with Austria "to abandon Bosnia and Herzgovina to the Hapsburgs as the price of an Austrian agreement to the Russian expedition against Turkey." (p. 370.)

During the Congress of Berlin and six years later at Skieriewice, declarations, both verbal and in the form of *aide-memoire,* had been exchanged between Austria-Hungary and Russia, according to which Russia would have no objections if, in the interests of Balkan tranquillity and European peace, Austria desired to make her occupation (of Bosnia and Herzegovina) an annexation. It was perfectly natural that Isvolski soon after the meeting at Reval (June, 1908), should have sent the Austrian Foreign Minister a written proposal to start negotiations, firstly for changing the occupation into an annexation, secondly for the opening of the Straits. (pp. 370-371.)

Count Aehrenthal and Isvolsky met at the former's Chateau of Buchlau, in Moravia on September 15, 1908, and agreed in principle with the proposed annexation. Isvolsky did not make any formal stipulation about the time of the formal proclamation of the annexation. Taking advantage of this carelessness on the part of the Russian Foreign Minister the Austrian Government proclaimed the annexation of Bosnia and Herzgovina on the 5th of October, 1908. This action on the part of the Austrians roused intense hostility in Serbia as well as Russia against Austria. The Austrian General Staff was anxious to start a war against Serbia. Kaiser Wilhelm II was much displeased with the action of the Austrian Government because it humiliated his favorites the Turks. He suggested to Bulow that he should demand "immediate withdrawal of the Austrian Emperor's edict of annexation, and demand, at the same time, the retirement of Austrian Foreign Minister, Count Aehrenthal" (p. 379). Bulow opposed any such action but assured him of the possibility of peaceful solution of the most difficult situation. Bulow wrote:

I would certainly not allow it to come to war. I was not disposed to allow the Austrians to take active measures against Serbia, still less against Russia, and naturally not against Italy. I would never abandon Austria; but I did not intend her to involve us in an European war. (pp. 379-380.)

In pursuance of this policy Germany used pressure that Austria might not take any rash action against Serbia whereas Russia, at the request of Germany used moderating influence over Serbia and thus a world war was averted. This was a great diplomatic victory for Germany. It was a great humiliation for Russia especially Isvolsky who failed to secure British and French support to his project of extending Russian control over the Dardanelles, while Russia had to acknowledge unconditional annexation of Bosnia and Herzgovina by Austria.

Prince Bulow repeatedly accused German statesmen especially Chancellor Bethman-Holweg of not using pressure against issuing an ultimatum by Austria against Serbia, after the Sarajevo murder. Germany should have called a conference of Powers to settle the question and avoided the World War. Bulow wrote,

A disastrous war could only end in revolution—that, till the day of my retirement, was always my profound conviction. (p. 99.)

He further wrote:

In that disastrous summer of 1914 if the diplomats of all the great Powers had kept their heads—the Germans, alas, lost theirs even worse than the others—if, in that fateful second half of July a conference of the Powers had been summoned to settle the Serbian-Austrian conflict, the most terrible catastrophe the world has seen for centuries could have been averted. (p. 220.)

5. *Anglo-German Relations:* For centuries Anglo-German relations were cordial, but by the end of the nineteenth century there were indications of unfriendliness between these two peoples. There were three reasons for this change: (a) British ill-feeling towards Kaiser Wilhelm II who antagonized his uncle King Edward (p. 189). Kaiser Wilhelm incurred hostility of powerful British statesmen, especially Lord Salisbury (p. 49) and others. (b) German competition in world markets and (c) political and naval rivalry due to the rise of German naval power. Occasionally it was suggested that the question of Anglo-German rivalry should be settled by an Anglo-German Alliance. But this was not possible because of opposition both in Great Britain and in Germany. Lord Salisbury as the Premier and Foreign Minister "was in favor of a good understanding with Germany; *but he had not wanted an alliance.*" This was the opinion of Earl Selborne. (p. 38.) This is also confirmed by the recent biography of Lord Salisbury by Lady Cecil. In Germany the Kaiser as well as influential statesmen did not wish to act as "Britain's tool against Russia." However all responsible statesmen of Great Britain and Germany as well as King Edward and Kaiser Wilhelm did not want a war between these two nations. Anglo-German estrangement grew by stages. After the conclusion of the Anglo-French Entente in 1905 and the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907 Britain did not need any alliance with Germany for her own safety; on the contrary Britain was working for her own security against the menace of a strong and growing German navy. Prince von Bulow was convinced that after the conclusion of the Anglo-Russian convention in August, 1907, Britain definitely decided against Germany. (p. 352.) However Bulow felt that King Edward, who detested his nephew Kaiser Wilhelm II, was opposed to any rupture with Germany. (p. 355.)

From various reports from Prince Metternich, German Ambassador in London, Hermann Ballin, Sir Ernest Cassel, Walter Rathenau and conversations with King Edward, Prince Bulow was convinced that the existing anti-German feeling in Britain was deep-seated and could not be removed without serious efforts on the part of Germany. Bulow was determined to adopt a policy which would lead to an understanding between Germany and Britain on the question of naval construction. On June 3rd, 1909, he called a conference of responsible German statesmen for the purpose. The Imperial Chancellor explained that

the ill-feeling between Germany and Great Britain is grounded on the suspicion that our (German) naval construction approximates too dangerously to the English. . . . It was not so much German rivalry in international markets, though this too was certainly disagreeable to the English, but actually the German naval policy which had caused this deep-seated distrust. (pp. 482-483.)

He further stated,

It is manifest that diplomatic measures no longer suffice to calm the English. *An agreement might perhaps be achieved on the basis of a simultaneous slowing-down of the tempo of naval construction. The best course would be to reach such an agreement in conjunction with an understanding on other questions, those for instance touching colonial or commercial policy, and those of a universally political nature.* (p. 482.)

Admiral von Tirpitz felt that the initiative for such a proposal could not come from the German side (p. 488). Unhappily Prince Bulow soon after this re-

signed from his position of Imperial Chancellorship. However on the very day of submitting his resignation he begged the Kaiser to see the necessity for slowing down German naval construction and the need of Anglo-German understanding, for the sake of world peace. It may be of interest to quote the conversation between the Kaiser and Prince Bulow:

Bulow: What I fear is this: That if we force—I stress the word *"force"*—our naval construction, we shall succeed in so irritating and disquieting the English that they will turn against us, if any great international complication gives them a chance to do so. H. M. (Kaiser): I cannot and will not allow John Bull to give me orders on how many ships I am to build. . . . Bulow: Your Majesty, I have only one thing more to say to you. Precisely because, to my deep regret, you refuse any naval agreement with England, you must be doubly prudent with the Russians. . . . I do think that the English will be so irritated by the rate of our naval construction that *they are likely to take the other side if we ever come to war with Russia.* (pp. 576-577.)

Kaiser Wilhelm rejected the wise advice of Prince Bulow on the presumption that the English would never dare to attack Germany. This idea was inculcated by self-seeking politicians and the pedantic German professor Schieman. The latter, at a dinner given to the Kaiser and Kaiserin by Bulow, after his resignation, said:

Your Majesty, I have very good and reliable news. The British Empire is cracking from end to end. In South Africa they're brewing up for a great insurrection of the Boers. Canada wants to join America. Australia is going to declare her independence and India is seething with unrest. The whole British Empire is going to pieces. (p. 594.)

The book is full of character sketches of many great personalities. Prince Bulow makes it very clear that personal antagonism among statesmen and monarchs often lead to unfriendly relations between nations. He shows that King Edward won over the Tsar of Russia to the side of Britain, by his pleasing personality and cleverness, whereas German-Russian relations drifted toward unfriendliness because of haughtiness on the part of Kaiser Wilhelm towards Count Lamsdorf and Isvolsky as well as towards the Tsar. The Kaiser incurred hostility of the Belgian monarch, because of the insulting treatment accorded to him by the Kaiser in Berlin. The Italian King did not like the German Kaiser because of the latter's over-bearing attitude. Kaiser Wilhelm was a good man with good intentions but he was no judge of men. He was weak and jealous of those who might rob him of his glory. He was a victim of flatterers. He was peace-loving and never wished a war, far from planning it; but he did not have the will-power and foresight to save his country and the world from the World War, by refusing to be dragged into the war. Morocco crisis was solved peacefully; Bosnian Crisis was settled through German firmness, backed by a deliberate peace policy. It was a matter of great tragedy that German statesmen did not demand a conference to settle the Austro-Serbian question in 1914. It was a greater blunder that Germany declared war on Russia as a matter of self-protection. This made the World War unavoidable and which has resulted in the greatest calamity the civilized world has ever seen. Germany never planned the World War; but the German statesmen, according to Prince von Bulow, were stupid to allow their country to be dragged into it.

TARAKNATH DAS.

New York City.

Trumpets on New Horizons

The Social Game

If half the world were not content to prey,
With many a leech-like mouth that sucks and reaches,
They might have time to think, and see how they
Are sucked by greater leeches.

STANTON A. COBLENTZ

The Wheels Are Still

In the little drab homes
That huddle near the mill,
Men think about bread—
For the wheels are still.

Mothers rarely smile,
And they dare not sob;
A home is tensely quiet
When a man has lost his job.

Raw stuff and finished stuff
Are piled across the land,
Yet cries of want are surging,
And fear has seized command.

If leaders dare not lead,
But meekly wish and wait,
Then know rebellion's hounds
Lurk just beyond the gate.

HENRY E. SWENSEN

Druid Circle

Who placed these stones about the field? Were they
Memorials left to honor ancient dead?
Who, now, shall fathom that far, remotest day
Of mistletoe; of superstitious dread?
Perhaps, for human sacrifice, they placed
This table-stone upon two others, there;
A boy (no longer lively, ruddy faced),
With ashy cheeks and crimson matted hair.
A boy! You have no word to say, unless
You curse the waste of all the girls and boys
Whose cheeks are blanched by factory dinginess;
Who die on battlefields in smoke and noise.
Oh, civilization, why do you despise
The way the Druids used to sacrifice?

JOY HAUSMANN

Tooth of Selfishness

Lobster and bear are granted a claw
For battering enemies into the raw;
And thorns are made for defense of thistles
As porcupines are equipped with bristles.
But the human tooth of our selfishness
Can bite and gnaw to greater excess.

MARGARET LATHROP LAW

Sun and Moon for the Few?

You slave in the land of the free
Are slashed by the whip of the strong,
You're dragged to the limbs of a tree
And torn in the name of a wrong.
You hang and the God from the sky
Is scoffing because you are black?
You're labeled and branded . . . but why?
Is God in his heaven so slack?
Content in his place in the sky,
He watches the hatred and fears;
The swinging of corpses on high
The torture, the hurt of the years?
The terror of mother and wife?
The cry of a bride of the slain?
The deadly betrayal of life;
And grief and the sham and the pain?

To leaven the darkness of night
The God is in me and in you!
The earth and the sky for the white?
The sun and the moon for the few?

FANIA KRUGER

Correspondence

Professor Macintosh and the Editor

I.

Editor of UNITY:

If I understand their respective contentions, I am not entirely satisfied with the position on war either of the editor of UNITY or of Professor Macintosh. The clash between the two men seems to me deplorable and unwarranted. They are in substantial agreement, if I mistake not.

Do you not, Mr. Editor, evade the question whether you would support a war if you believed it morally justified, when you adduce the belief that no war can be morally justified? The question assumes the possibility that a war can be morally justified. To refuse support of a war that is morally justified would simply be to act immorally. Whether there ever was or can be such a war is another question which should be considered by itself, not jumbled with the former question.

I think Professor Macintosh was mistaken when he believed that the entrance of the United States into the World War was morally justified, and evidently he is himself strongly inclined—to say the least—to think now that he was mistaken then, "Why should it be supposed," he asks, "that I have learned nothing since 1918?"

I call myself an absolute pacifist, something that Professor Macintosh is unwilling to do. The difference between us is a matter of words rather than of morals. Whether it is conceivable that a war might be morally justified depends on one's definition of war. I think I distinguish between war and policing more rigorously than Professor Macintosh does. I believe in policing. It is indispensable. It sometimes involves the coercion by physical force of wrongdoing or dangerous individuals. But I do not believe in war. War is concerned not with individuals as such, but with nations, entire populations of men, women and children, whom it involves in disaster with no discrimination between the innocent and the guilty. The police of one city never fight the police of a neighboring city, but they cooperate in running down criminals. Armies and navies, however, function as such only when they fight other armies and navies. No upright citizen is disturbed by the police. War, on the other hand, is the killing of upright, patriotic, even Christian men by other upright, patriotic, even Christian men; of choice youth from universities by other choice youth from universities; the losses being approximately man for man. War is perhaps the stunting of a generation of innocent children by a starvation blockade.

The analogy of war with policing is false. Policing, in the sense of restraining wrongdoing individuals, is reasonable, necessary, fully justified by experience, absolutely essential to civilized society. War, on the other hand, is abysmally irrational, inherently suicidal, absolutely incompatible with civilization. The word that fits it is *insanity*.

I should say emphatically that the sending of British troops to Palestine "to keep the Arabs from slaughtering the relatively defenseless Jews" was not war but policing. No pacifist objects when soldiers are used for policing, although policing is not their specific function, and they probably do not perform it as well as trained policemen would. As General Leonard Wood said: "The business of the policeman is to control; the business of the soldier is to kill." When Decatur cleaned out the nest of Barbary pirates, he did a good job of policing. These examples of the use of soldiers suggest a "twilight zone" between war and policing. There may be situations in which it is difficult to tell where and when policing shades into war. The Japanese government stoutly maintains that it is not at war with China but only doing necessary policing. Our government takes the same ground regarding its operations in Nicaragua. I think both these governments at fault in the matters specified, but there is room for differences of opinion thereon.

For all practical purposes the difference between war and policing is clear enough. That difference once adequately recognized by Professor Macintosh, I believe he would not hesitate to declare that he will never sanction or support war, as ten thousand other ministers of our country have recently declared.

HENRY W. PINKHAM

Newton Centre, Mass.

II

Editor of UNITY:

I am interested in your correspondence with the rejected applicant for citizenship (Professor Macintosh). Do you know, I really think Professor Macintosh thinks the same as you regarding the matter of war, only he can't bring himself to make an unequivocal statement. Does he not say virtually, that there could not be the kind of war that he would fight in, but if there were such a war, he would fight?

D. S.

New York, N. Y.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 378)

armies of the U. S. A. or a Quaker Secretary of War is not orthodox! It is not the Quaker Way. I fear that the Quakers here will be content to work with the world-wise diplomats to reduce the arms a little, and think that gain. They possess a much better formula—why not apply that, and keep on applying it, until the world comes up to their formula? The world says that their formula is unpractical. Who says that? Instead, they have a right to exclaim, the Quaker Way—no sword, no violence—is the only practical way! Hear, ye nations, this is the Way of God! Since when did the State speak to the Quaker, with the voice of infallibility? I feel so much concern over the Quakers, because to them has "been given the Law," the Way of Peace. Hundreds of thousands, now longing for permanent peace, would follow if the Quakers, like Moses, would arise and lead from Egypt's bondage!

Japan. Much there is that I have thought the past two months about Japan. What she has done in Manchuria has received, I fear, the acquiescence of one or two of the big Powers. For example, while Japan was roundly criticised by the American press, the British press on the whole was favorable, and Japan was referred to more than once as "our old ally." France has not become excited over the aggression in Manchuria. Of course, both Britain and France (and U. S. A.) have pulled off too many similar enterprises to say much! Who knows what other "parties" they may have in mind?

I received a letter from a Japanese friend, in which he enumerated the incidents in history, in which, during the past century or more, three-fourths of the earth's surface had been preempted by the white West, that from Suez through the Panama, clear round the world, the best and large places were taken by the white man, etc. . . . Here was my reply to him:

"You have given a clear and logical arraignment of the aggressions of the Western countries for the past century and more. There is no reply but to be ashamed and hang one's head; and to seek every opportunity to avoid repetition, and, also, to restore 'stolen property.' As you know I have long felt that the United States should admit Asiatics; also, have strongly urged that the Philippines should be restored to the Filipinos, that Australia should be divided—the most of it—among the Asiatics. . . . I would favor calling a Pacific Conference (have so published) for the purpose of re-allotting territory all round the Pacific Ocean. In most questions involving East and West, I generally stand with the East. The saddest feature about the Manchurian affair is that it is likely to divide Asia, and give the white West a new chance for exploitation. All efforts tending to bring Japan and China and India together would receive my warmest sympathy."

Dr. Henry Cohen, Galveston, shows his concern about disarmament, in a letter: "We have had disarmament on our minds for some years. . . . Man's selfishness at the moment is unutterable. India seems to be seething, and China and Japan are at loggerheads if not actually fighting. The nations of the world are anxious to increase their armament, and a new factor has entered—aeroplane warfare! God alone knows the end! Do your best."

Jerome K. Jerome said something in 1919, that ought to give us thought.

He said, "The attempt to build a League of Nations upon the shifting sands of passions and hatreds that are already changing before our eyes, on the self-interests of the moment that today draw some particular group of nations together, that tomorrow will drive them asunder, is sheer folly. . . . The League of Nations will come when mankind has grasped the fact that Christ was the only practical statesman the world ever produced."

S. S.

The Futility of Violence

Lost in thought, I was returning from an early morning walk along the embankment road at Dighaghat, when the sudden sound of beating and shouting roused me from my reverie. Looking up I saw, in front of me, a little iron-grey horse dragging a *tumtum,* with its ears laid back and its tail between its legs, jibbing with all its might, while one man was pulling at its head, another sitting up in the cart belaboring it with a stick, two or three more shoving and pushing at the *tumtum,* and all shouting themselves hoarse.

Without saying a word, I went up and took the horse's head in my hands. All the men stopped still and watched in silence. I adjusted the bridle, which was half torn off, and with a little caressing and a few soft words, suggested to the horse that it would be best to come along. He hesitated for a minute, and then, stepping forward, walked quietly by my side as I led him along the road. I could not persuade him to trot, and that was no wonder, as the cart was overloaded and the harness badly adjusted. So we made the best of slow and sure progress.

When we reached the turning to the Vidyapith, I said good-bye to the party and wished them well. But I had gone hardly a few steps down the path, when I heard the shouting and beating recommence. The men had restarted their old method. This time the horse jibbed worse than ever. He ran backwards, he twisted round, and not all the men combined could do anything with him. At last they realized their futility, they ceased their shouting and beating, and the driver got down from his seat and quietly led away the horse by the head. In this fashion they disappeared out of sight.

How each one of us clings to violence in spite of all the lessons, great and small, which we daily receive! And man in the aggregate—is he not just as foolish? How England has bled, browbeaten and abused India these many years, thinking to get all she wanted out of her thereby, and now that India is beginning to "jib," she is surprised and offended!

And, thus musing, I walk away lost in a new reverie.

—*Mira.*

Young India.

Institutes of International Relations

Building a National Personality

"Nations are great on the basis of their personality; not their military power, or economic strength." Thus the Rev. Leyton Richards expressed one of the central ideas of the two Institutes of International Relations conducted during June by the American Friends Service Committee, at Haverford College.

These two Institutes were more successful than had been even hoped for. The limit of enrollment in each was set at 150. This limit was reached in the Institute first held, for ministers, club leaders, peace workers in general. The second Institute, for educators, the first of its kind, had an enrollment of about 140, mostly interested and enthusiastic teachers, with a few other workers with young people.

There can be no doubt of the eagerness of many teachers for such expert advice and leadership as was offered here, and the Service Committee now plans to hold at least two Institutes annually, the one, as in the past two years, for peace workers in general; the other, to help teachers in their task of training the rising generation in world citizenship.

Both Institutes were attended by persons from Canada and from all parts of the United States. At the first were 25 or 30 young Methodist ministers preparing for summer conference work; and as many young men and women, who were going out in the Peace Caravan service of the Quakers and the Church of the Brethren.

The religious element was a vital part of both gatherings—the morning meeting for worship, and the course on the spiritual aspects of the struggle for peace, most inspiringly conducted by Leyton Richards, of the Carrs Lane Presbyterian Church, Birmingham, England, and Henry Cadbury, of Bryn Mawr College. Truly religious, too, was the spirit of good-will and cooperation which pervaded the groups—the very spirit which is required for the success of the world community.

This spirit was greatly assisted by the informality of the gatherings. The students lived in the college dormitory, and ate in the college dining-room. Many of the instructors lived with them, and formed a part of the general group, for further discussion, or for general conversation.

These instructors, too, were of the highest grade, while such additional lecturers as Norman Thomas, Bishop McConnell, Frederick J. Libby, James G. McDonald, and Agnes MacPhail, only woman member of the Canadian Parliament, gave deep inspiration, or special information on vital topics.

In each Institute a solid foundation of fact was given by courses of lectures, extending through the two weeks, on the political and economic facts and problems of peace in "our machinery of life—civilization." The major emphasis was on the necessity of building the attitude of mind which recognizes the world today as a single community, and armaments as "an expression of diseased international relations."

Phone Oakland 0489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
JOHNSON'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs,
Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

A New Volume of
The New Humanist
begins with the
January-February Issue
containing
A Meditation on Modernism
by A. Eustace Haydon
Parrington: A Liberal of the Northwest
by Alexander P. Cappon
Tragedy, and the Mystery of Nature
by F. S. Stowell
A Sketch of Gandhi
by Sureth C. Banerji
Discussions and Book Reviews
by Henry Nelson Wieman, Robert J. Hutcheon, Radislov A. Tasanoff, Eldred C. Vanderlaan, Hugh S. Tigner, James Horton, Walter Kahoe, Harold Buschman.
Subscription, One Dollar
Single Copy, Twenty Cents
THE NEW HUMANIST
14 West First Street
DAYTON, OHIO